

**REMARKS****A. Introduction**

In the non-final office action mailed on June 14, 2006, the Examiner allowed claims 1-5, 27-35, and 50; objected to the specification; and rejected claims 36, 37, and 53-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Eyal (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,537) in view of Mills (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,940). Applicants herein amend the specification, and amend claim 53 and cancel claims 6-26, 36-49 and 51-52 to clarify the subject matter for which applicants seek protection. As a result, claims 1-5, 27-35, 50, and 53-55 are now pending. For the reasons discussed in detail below, applicants submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

**B. Objection to Specification**

Applicants herein amend the specification to address the bases for this objection. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this objection be reconsidered and Original.

**C. Applicants' Technology**

Applicants' technology relates to searching documents, such as web pages, using a "dimensional model" of these documents, which is based on a multidimensional database. The documents are typically indexed in the dimensional model by extracting and storing attribute information manually or by some automatic process, such as spidering. (par. 0025).

In some cases, a dimensional model consists of (a) multiple dimension tables, each for a particular document attribute and having one row containing each different value of the attribute across the indexed documents, and (b) a single fact table having one row corresponding to each document that contains, for each attribute, a pointer to the dimension table row containing the document's value for that attribute.

D. Rejection of Claims 53-55

Claim 53 has been amended to add the dimensional model structure language of claim 27: "the model comprising a fact table and two or more dimension tables, the fact table being comprised of rows each containing a document reference and referencing, for each attribute for which an attribute value was extracted, a row corresponding to the attribute value in a dimension table of the dimensional model corresponding to the attribute." As noted by the Examiner with respect to claim 27, both Eyal and Mills fail to disclose this recited structure.

Eyal allows a user to "search for web pages on the Internet, and to view search results in an animated fashion." (col. 3, lines 31-33). Rather than returning a list of links to web pages, Eyal presents the first result and buttons that allow a user to browse back and forth between search results. As stated by the Examiner, "Eyal fails to explicitly disclose a method for maintaining a dimensional model of a group of documents, the dimensional model reflecting values for a plurality of differentiated attributes for each of the documents of the group."

Mills describes a system for building a database of classification, contact, and geographic ("CCG") data from web pages posted on computer networks. A web developer first encodes web pages with CCG data using tags embedded within the HTML. A web crawler then crawls the web, adding records to a database corresponding to the CCG data found within each crawled web page. Users can query the database to search for web pages containing particular CCG data. (col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 13). Mills describes, "using a 2 dimensional table database" to "handle properties having multiple values of the same type," such as a document with multiple authors. (col. 21, lines 36-46). Mills uses dimension tables only when a particular document attribute has multiple values, which differs from amended claim 56, which recites each row of the fact table "referencing for *each attribute for which an attribute value was extracted* (from the document), a row (of a

dimension table)." As the Examiner recognized, Mills fails to disclose using the dimensional model structure for all document attributes, as recited.

Accordingly, applicants submit that claim 53 is allowable over the cited references and respectfully request that the rejection be Original.

Claims 54 and 55 are dependent on claim 53 and further recite additional elements that make them patentable over Eyal and Mills. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be Original.

E. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, or believes a telephone conference would facilitate examination, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 577288027US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

1/4/07

Respectfully submitted,

By

Steven D. Lawrenz

Registration No.: 37,376

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant